

1 **MICHAEL N. FEUER, City Attorney**  
2 **THOMAS H. PETERS, Chief Assistant City Attorney**  
3 **ERIC BROWN, Dep. City Attorney (State Bar No. 170410)**  
4 **Email: Eric.Brown@lacity.org**  
5 **200 North Main Street, 6<sup>th</sup> Floor**  
6 **Los Angeles, California 90012**  
7 **Telephone: 213.978.7508**  
8 **Facsimile: 213.978.7011**

9  
10 **Attorneys for Defendant City of Los Angeles,**  
11 **Lt. Andrew Mathis, Sgt. Hamer and Sgt. Richter**

12  
13 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**

14 **CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
CARL MITCHELL, MICHEAL  
ESCOBEDO, SALVADOR ROQUE,  
JUDY COLEMAN, as individuals; LOS  
ANGELES CATHOLIC WORKER,  
CANGRESS, as organizations,

PLAINTIFFS,

v.

CITY OF LOS ANGELES, a municipal  
entity; LT. ANDREW MATHIS, SGT.  
HAMER and SGT. RICHTER, in their  
individual and official capacities,

DEFENDANTS.

**CASE NO. CV16-01750 SJO (JPRx)**  
*[Assigned to the Honorable S. James  
Otero, Courtroom 1]*

**NINTH STIPULATION TO  
CONTINUE HEARING DATE OF  
THE CITY OF LOS ANGELES'  
MOTION FOR CLARIFICATION OF  
ORDER**

**[Submitted with proposed order]**

**Date: March 20, 2017**

**Time: 10 a.m.**

**Place: Courtroom 10C**

## STIPULATION TO EXTEND TIME

It is hereby stipulated between Plaintiffs and the City of Los Angeles, Lt. Andrew Mathis, Sgt. Hamer and Sgt. Richter (collectively "the City") as follows:

1. The City has filed a Motion for Clarification of the Court's order of April 13, 2016 issuing a preliminary injunction. The motion was originally set for July 25, 2016.

2. Over the past several months, the City and Plaintiffs engaged in several mediation sessions on the City's concerns underlying the motion on multiple dates beginning on May 9, 2016, before the Honorable Carla Woehrle. Progress was made in those sessions, and the parties agreed to continue the process.

3. Each of the parties has engaged in additional separate discussions with former Magistrate Judge Woehrle and have provided written responses to the issues under discussion. The discussions with former Magistrate Judge Woehrle are continuing. The parties are presently awaiting a written document from the judge, setting forth the parties' respective positions on the remaining issues, after which the parties will see if some or all of those matters can be resolved.

4. Under the present schedule, Plaintiffs' opposition to the motion is currently due February 27, 2017.

5. To avoid the necessity of Plaintiffs opposing the motion when the parties are still engaged in mediation, the parties request that the motion hearing date be continued.

6. In light of the schedule of Judge Woerhle, the parties believe another extension of the time for Plaintiffs' to file their opposition would be appropriate and that the current hearing date should be continued from March 20, 2017 to allow the mediation discussions to continue.

1       7. The Plaintiffs and the City hereby stipulate, subject to Court approval,  
2 to continue the hearing date of the motion for clarification to April 24, 2017, in order  
3 to give the parties an opportunity to reach consensus on the issues underlying the  
4 motion.

5

6

It is so stipulated.

7

8 Dated: February 27, 2017

CITY OF LOS ANGELES

9

10

By: /s/ Eric Brown  
Eric Brown, Deputy City Attorney  
Attorneys for Defendants

11

12

13 Dated: February 27, 2017

LAW OFFICE OF CAROL A. SOBEL

14

15

16

By: /s/ Carol A. Sobel  
Carol A. Sobel  
Attorneys for Plaintiffs

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28